

Irrefutable Proof The Landings Were Faked

Amazon review by Z8, of “Moon Man” by Bart Sibrel.

As a 24 year USAF veteran, I wish it were not so. Bart provides so much proof the landings were faked, it is overwhelming. In a way, after of 50 years of inability to return to the Moon, it seems more implausible that we were able to go--six times on a slide rule--than these events simply being staged.

After following Bart's evidence to the logical conclusion, I find that even more smoking guns emerge. The fact is, this was hard if not impossible to fake, and NASA, surprisingly, perhaps because they were rushed, did a poor job faking the missions. There are astonishing mistakes. Bart does an excellent job documenting a large number of mistakes, but there are more.

A handful of problems that I find impossible to dismiss are listed, below. Some follow Bart's revelations a little farther, and a few are different.

1. No gravity on the trip to the Moon and back. As an Aerospace Engineer and USAF pilot for 20+ years, I do understand the physics of weightlessness in orbit. Apparently, the orchestrators of these missions missed that class. Namely, that weightlessness only occurs in planetary orbit, it is an artifact of falling at the same speed as the curvature of the

planet, below, falls away from you. The typical classroom thought experiment envisions shooting a canon. The farther you shoot, the farther the shell travels as it falls. If you shoot far enough, you'll actually hit yourself, as the shell circles the Earth. Shoot even farther and it'll complete more than one orbit. Shoot at just the right rate, and the shell will fall at the exact rate the Earth's surface curves away, and the shell will go into orbit. That constant falling is why an orbiting spacecraft feels "weightless." But on a trip, radially away from Earth toward the Moon, the astronauts will absolutely feel some weight. Yet, Aldrin does several experiments demonstrating weightlessness, half way between the Earth and Moon, even showing the Earth as a full globe out the window which Bart beautifully debunks as a portion of the Earth's surface, filmed while in orbit, shaped by the circular port hole window. The demonstration of weightlessness actually proves the astronauts were in Earth orbit, not half way to the Moon. The weightless experiments, broadcast on live TV, do prove beyond ANY doubt the missions were fraudulent.

2. Related to 1. Because NASA decided to use a simple optical trick to make the Earth look far away while actually in orbit (by moving the camera back from the circular window, as Bart proves with uncovered film of the astronauts discussing the illusion), something impossible is recorded for all of posterity. This is another, indisputable, smoking gun, and it's on NASA's own film reels for all to see. Bart ingeniously points out their "round Earth" is just a view through a "soda straw" of the port hole window. But this

method has a major flaw, it takes a small circular portion of the Earth's surface, and presents it as the full diameter. Back then, we didn't routinely see satellite views of the entire diameter of the Earth, but today, it's commonplace. We now understand that the largest storms are around 200 miles wide, compared to the Earth's 8,000 mile diameter. Tiny, by comparison.

Sure enough, the actual Apollo 11 film footage from this event shows single clouds spanning the entire diameter of the Earth, an absurd image for today's satellite-savvy audience to swallow. Specifically, there is a V shaped cloud that spans the entire planetary diameter. Utterly impossible, and it proves Bart is right, this is a fraud, without any doubt. Whatsoever.

You can see the footage of the astronauts discussing the fake on Bart's links, which he provides in the book. Better still, you can see the resulting NASA high res film footage of the fake globe with 8,000 mile long clouds by searching:

"Apollo 11 - Unscheduled TV - 010:32:36 GET"

I could go on, and on, and on, and on, with hundreds more inexcusable errors illuminated by Bart and others. But just a few more:

3. The lack of a blast crater under the Lunar Lander after it fired its 10,000 lb rocket motor directly into the dust caked Moon surface from just a few feet away. On the Moon, that's

almost 2,000 lbs of raw thrust, the same as a supersonic T-38 jet engine, at full power, pointed straight down into dust/regolith, dust that the astronauts later kick around like sand on a beach. Absurd. Imagine pointing a supersonic jet's engine straight into sand on a beach at point blank range. Now do it with 5/6ths less gravity, without disturbing a single grain of sand.

4. The Lunar Module landing film's lack of communication delay. Search:

"Apollo 11 landing from PDI to Touchdown"

For a short time, when communications get heated, the time delay between Houston and the Lander, caused by relatively slow radio waves traveling 220,000 miles at the speed of light's tortoise-like 186,000/second, completely disappears. They talk and respond like they are next door.

5. As a former USAF pilot, I know how hard manual aircraft rejoins are, finding, then joining two aircraft in formation. It's a skill that takes many years to develop and master. Joining the Lunar module with the Lunar Orbiter, using launch timing from a wind-up wrist watch, at 4000 mph, in the vastness of space, visually, from an entirely unknown launch angle based on how the lander settled, with no horizon reference, no air to brake you, with very limited miniature thrusters, in 1/6th gravity, is BEYOND ridiculous. Six times, without a hitch. No.

6. Better communication clarity than my cell phone, from the Moon. Sprint has a lot to learn. NASA was used to corded phone lines, they had no idea how hard it would be to call someone wirelessly, crystal clearly, even on our own planet.

And of course...

7. SpaceX blowing up hundreds of rockets trying to land on their tail using super computers, high speed GPS tracking, and ring laser gyro stabilization, inputting thousands of computer calculated corrections per second. It's very hard to do with today's technology. But Armstrong did it, fully manually, in a totally unfamiliar gravity paradigm... first try. As did every other Apollo mission. No. Sorry. We know better, now. SpaceX isn't THAT incompetent (although they have asked for 8 years more time to (re)invent a super simple Lunar Lander).

8 through n... Bart shows the depressing behavior of the post mission astronauts press events, their unanimous inability to remember if they could see stars from the Moon's surface, their complete unfamiliarity with the Van Allen problem, so many photos with major problems, the ability of film to survive +220F, -220F temperatures and the unshielded radiation of space, surviving the hail of 25,000 mph micrometeorites on the Moon's fully unprotected surface, the lack of any bad photos with manual focus-aperture-shutter speed and no viewfinder, orange juice literally squirting through the vacuum of space, puffs of wind waving the flag on

the Moon as an astronaut runs a bit too close, visible oil leaks from the rover's wheel hubs in a vacuum, and Moonscapes that can now be overlayed, using modern tools like Photoshop, to reveal the base photos were reused across different Apollo missions' landing sites.

In the bitter end, it's not hard to conclude the missions weren't real, sadly, the opposite is true.

So, THANK YOU, Bart Sibrel, for exposing the worst lie in human history. It takes incredible moral strength, and thanks to you, we now understand what our government is capable of. The only question remaining in my mind is... was it a well intentioned lie, or a petty heist of \$150 billion dollars. I wonder what the original outspoken skeptics: Grissom, White, and Chaffee, would say?

Source: <https://www.amazon.com/gp/aw/d/1513686569/>